

Appl. No. 09/587,403
Amdt. Dated January 12, 2006
Reply to Office Action Dated October 12, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 81866.0025
Customer No.: 26021

Remarks:

This is in response to the Office Action dated October 12, 2005. Pursuant to this amendment, claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

The Office Action refers to an appeal brief filed on November 24, 2003. This is inaccurate. The appeal brief in this matter was filed July 13, 2005. The Office Action concedes that the appealed final rejection was improper. This application has been pending over five years. Prompt favorable action is requested.

The Office Action relies in part on the Water patent, U.S. Patent No. 6,564,216, which it concedes has nothing to do with domain names or managing the information related to domain names. The Office Action combines the Waters patent with a document that the Office Action identifies as "InterNIC: Updating the domain name and associated records." This response will refer to the secondary reference as the InterNIC reference.

This response will treat the InterNIC reference as if it were prior art, but does not concede that fact. It is not clear whether and how the InterNIC reference might have been published or come to be known by the public. The InterNIC reference bears on its lower right hand corner the date "9/22/05." At a minimum this means the reference has been modified in ways that applicant cannot know. The InterNIC reference appears to be incomplete.

More significantly, the InterNIC reference does not approach teaching the present invention. What is described in the InterNIC reference is a plan that allows the recognized contact for a domain name to make changes to the contact information or to make changes about a name server:

"To change information for the existing contact – the contact modifies his/her contact record using Contact Template

To change information about a name server – contact for the host uses Host Template to modify record”

“[T]he contacts listed on the Domain Name Registration Agreement are individuals or organizations who are authorized to act on behalf of a domain name’s registrant in matters related to the domain name.” InterNIC reference at 4.

The InterNIC reference makes it clear that only the recognized contact for a domain name is able to make changes to the domain name information. As noted above, the Waters patent does not teach anything about domain names.

By contrast, the present application describes a system that allows an agent to act for a domain name registrant. The domain management system allows an agent to be authorized to make changes to a domain name’s zone information and other information. The domain management system may store authorization information so that the domain management system does not need to reauthorize an agent or operator that has earlier been authorized. Such a system is neither taught nor suggested by the prior art.

Claim 1 distinguishes over the combination of the Office Action by reciting:

“an authorization checker responsive to an input from the agent to check whether an administrative or technical contact for the active domain name has identified to the domain management system that the agent has authority to alter information about the active domain name and, if the agent lacks authority for the active domain name, the authorization checker generating a communication to the administrative or technical contact to determine if the agent should be given authority for the active domain name.”

The combination cited in the Office Action only allows a contact to make changes to domain name information and so would never provide a mechanism for an agent to be authorized to make such changes. Consequently, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-6 distinguish over the cited art and are in condition for allowance.

Claim 7 distinguishes over the combination of the Office Action by reciting:

“an authentication checker that determines, in response to the identification information, if a contact identified within a zone file for the active domain name has authorized the operator to make changes to information within the zone file for the active domain name.”

The combination cited in the Office Action only allows a contact to make changes to domain name information and so would never provide a mechanism for an agent to be authorized to make such changes. Consequently, claim 7 and its dependent claims 8-20 distinguish over the cited art and are in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (310) 785-4600 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Appl. No. 09/587,403
Amdt. Dated January 12, 2006
Reply to Office Action Dated October 12, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 81866.0025
Customer No.: 26021

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: January 12, 2006

By: 

William H. Wright
Registration No. 36,312
Attorney for Applicant

2049 Century Park East, Suite 700
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Phone: 310-789-5100
Fax: 310-789-5400